



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/893,156	06/27/2001	James John Wilson	DN2001117	DN2001117 3836	
7	590 05/19/2004	EXAM	EXAMINER		
The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company Patent & Trademark Department - D/823 1144 East Market Street, D/823 Akron, OH 44316-0001			CHARLES,	CHARLES, MARCUS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3682	3682	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)	1
		09/893,156	WILSON ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Marcus Charles	3682	
Period fe	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addre	9SS
THE - External control	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13  SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	66(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day; ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this comm D (35 U.S.C. & 133)	nunication.
Status				
·	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>17 Fee</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowan closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro		erits is
Disposit	ion of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or			. *
Applicat	ion Papers			
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on <u>27 June 2001</u> is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the dependent drawing sheet(s) including the correction to the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	☑ accepted or b)☐ objected to Irawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1	
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
. a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ty documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Sta	ge
Attachmen	t(s)		·	
1)	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)			2)
	r No(s)/Mail Date	6)		

Art Unit: 3682

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is responsive to the remarks/argument filed 02/17/04, which has been entered. Claims 1-5 are currently pending.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janne (5,382,198) in view of Miranti, Jr. Janne discloses a power transmission having an inner surface comprising longitudinally extending grooves (19) and transverse grooves (20) that are inclined at an angle ( $\alpha$ ) less that 90° relative the longitudinal direction of the belt, and all the transverse grooves have the same depth, the transverse and longitudinal grooves form rows of cogs on the belt inner surface. Janne further discloses that it is known for the grooves to have randomized spacing to distribute the noise over a wide frequency range (col.1, line 36-45). Janne does not disclose that the cogs having at least three different longitudinal lengths and are randomly arranged in a non-sequential manner along the length of the belt. Miranti, Jr. discloses a transmission belt (20) comprising cogs that are randomly arranged in a non-sequential manner along the length of the belt (figs. 8-9) in order to distribute the noise over a wide frequency range and to reduce noise during normal operation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the belt of

Application/Control Number: 09/893,156

Art Unit: 3682

Janne so that the cogs are randomly arranged in a non-sequential manner along the length of the belt in view of Miranti, Jr. order to distribute the noise over a wide frequency range and to reduce noise during normal operation.

In claims 2-3, note fig. 8-9 of Miranti, Jr. shows the cogs having at least three to six different lengths.

Regarding claim 4, Miranti, Jr. clearly shows not more than fours rows of cogs have the same length.

Regarding claim 5, Janne and Miranti, Jr. does not disclose the claimed sequence of the cogs. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to arrange the cogs in any desired sequence such as that of the claimed invention, since applicant has not disclosed that such claimed sequence solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the sequence of Miranti, Jr.

## Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 2/17/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant contended that none of the embodiments of the invention of Miranti, Jr. shows the cog grooves are staggered in a non-sequential manner but teaches sequential random arrangements along the length of the belt. Applicant also states that Miranti, Jr. further states in col. 6, lines 53-60, that a random of arrangements comprises a sequence of "34 spacing", and concludes that there is a repetition of sequences over and over again along the length of the belt. In response, Mirinti, Jr. clearly discloses the cog grooves can be arranged in a non-sequential

Application/Control Number: 09/893,156

Art Unit: 3682

manner such as a matrix. Col. 6, lines 20-27. While it is true that Mirinti, Jr. discloses various sequential patterns for the groups of grooves, Miranti, Jr. is also discloses the use of randomly staggering the rows to reduce noise in the belt system. Applicant also argued that the Miranti, Jr. shows a pattern of repeating sequence over the entire length of the belt. In response, col. 6, lines 29-30), Miranti, Jr. teaches an example of a non-sequential random staggering pattern of rows (A-E) of belt construction (20A). This non-sequential pattern is repeated along the length of the belt, but they are repeated sequentially in groups and each row of the group is non-sequentially staggered. Thus, it is clear that each row is non-sequentially arranged along the entire length of the belt. Accordingly, the rejection in view of Janne in view of Miranti, Jr. is proper.

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3682

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marcus Charles whose telephone number is (703) 305-6877. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday 7:30 am-600 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bucci can be reached on (703) 308-3668. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Marcus Charles
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3682
May 15,2004